REMARKS

Claims in the case are 1-9, 11-18 and 37-39, upon entry of this amendment. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and Claim 10 has been cancelled herein. No Claims have been added herein. Claims 19-36 were previously cancelled in an amendment dated 8 July 2003.

Applicants submit that entry of the present amendment is deemed to be a matter of right as it places the claims in condition for allowance in accordance with the Examiner's comments on page 5 of the Office Action of 25 March 2004 regarding Claims 10 and 11 being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (*i.e.*, Claim 1) and any intervening claims. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1, Claim 10 has been cancelled, and Claim 11 has been amended to depend from present Claim 1 (rather than cancelled Claim 10) by amendment herein.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,100,204 (**Makihara et al**) This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendments herein and the following remarks.

The present rejection does not include Claim 10. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein. As such, the present rejection is deemed to be moot.

For the record, Applicants wish to counter certain points of argument made in the Office Action of 25 March 2004. Makihara et al discloses a seat frame structure that includes a seat back frame (e.g., 24) having: a rigid blow molded hollow seat frame main body (e.g., 28); and a metal mounting member (e.g., 30) that is fixed to a surface of the rigid seat frame main body. See the abstract, Figures 1 and 2, and column 5, lines 13-14 of Makihara et al. The rigid seat frame main body (e.g., 28) and the metal mounting member (e.g., 30) are fixed to each other by edge portions (e.g., 32 and 40) of notched hole portion (e.g., 38) of the metal mounting member being embedded in the plastic material of the rigid molded seat frame main body during blow molding thereof. See Figure 5, and column 6, lines 47-56 of Makihara et al.

Makihara et al disclosure is directed to a *seat frame structure* for a vehicle seat, that is disclosed as being used for purposes of supporting other seat elements, such as a cushion seat (26). Makihara et al provide no disclosure, teaching or suggestion as to the use of their seat frame structure alone, or in the absence of other seat features, such as a separate seat cushion. Makihara et al disclose their seat frame structure as being used for a vehicle seat, not as a vehicle seat. As such, the blow-molded seat frame main body (e.g., 28) of Makihara et al by necessity must be rigid. If Makihara et al's blow-molded seat frame main body were flexible, the seat frame structure would not function as a seat frame. Makihara et al provide no disclosure, or suggestion as to the blow-molded seat frame main body of their seat frame structure being fabricated from a flexible thermoplastic resin. In light of what Makihara et al actually disclose, a skilled artisan would not be reasonably expected to interpret the disclosure thereof as somehow encompassing a blow-molded seat frame main body of flexible thermoplastic material.

Makihara et al do not disclose or otherwise suggest the presence of an anchoring extension in their seat frame structure. Figure 5 of Makihara et al is merely a cross section of the plastic material of rigid blow molded hollow seat frame main body (28) extending through notched hole portion (38). It appears that the arguments of the Office Action are perhaps based at least in part on confusing the clear space (with back lines) of Makihara et al's Figure 5 as being a separate structure, when in fact it is nothing more than a void, as would be recognized by a skilled artisan.

Makihara et al do not disclose or suggest the anchoring extensions of Applicants' molded article, in which the rigid support has a plurality of anchoring extensions extending into the flexible member, each of the anchoring extensions having walls, an interior chamber and at least one wall perforation in the walls, each wall perforation having edges, a portion of the flexible member extends through at least some of the wall perforations into the chamber, the edges of the wall perforations being embedded in the plastic material extending there-through, thereby fixedly attaching the flexible member to the rigid support. See Applicants' Claim 17 and Figure 5 (which is a sectional representation of an anchoring extension according to Applicants' invention). The anchoring extensions of Applicants' Claim

17 extend from the rigid support, have walls, an interior chamber and at least one perforation in the walls thereof. In the sectional view of Makihara et al's Figure 5 the metal mounting member (31) does not include an anchoring extension extending there-from having walls, an interior chamber and at least one perforation in the walls thereof into which plastic material of the blow-molded seat frame main body extends. The void shown in Figure 5 is not part of nor is it defined by the metal mounting member. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action has mischaracterized Figure 5 of Makihara et al.

Figure 4 of Makihara et al provides no representation of molded-in texture in the outer or exterior surface of blow-molded seat frame main body (28). The written specification of Makihara et al provides no disclosure or suggestion of the exterior surface of the blow-molded seat frame main body having molded-in texture. The exterior surface of blow-molded seat frame main body (28) of Figure 4 is smooth, as would be recognized by a skilled artisan. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action has mischaracterized Figure 4 of Makihara et al.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unanticipated by and patentable over Makihara et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makihara et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the amendments herein and the following remarks.

The present rejection does not include Claim 10. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein. As such, the present rejection is deemed to be moot.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unobvious and patentable over Makihara et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makihara et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,120,100 **(Palazzolo et al)**. In light of the amendments herein and the following remarks, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present rejection does not include Claim 10. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein. As such, the present rejection is deemed to be moot.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unobvious and patentable over Makihara et al in view of Palazzolo et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makihara et al in view of United States Patent No. 5,522,645 (**Dahlbacka**). This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendments herein and the following remarks.

The present rejection does not include Claim 10. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein. As such, the present rejection is deemed to be moot.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unobvious and patentable over Makihara et al in view of Dahlbacka. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Makihara et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the amendments herein and the following remarks.

The present rejection does not include Claim 10. The subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein. As such, the present rejection is deemed to be moot.

For the record, Applicants wish to counter certain points of argument made in the Office Action of 25 March 2004. As discussed previously herein, Makihara et al does not disclose, teach or suggest that the blow-molded seat frame main body of their seat frame structure as being flexible. Makihara et al disclosure is directed to a *seat frame structure* for a vehicle seat, that is disclosed as being used for purposes of supporting other seat elements, such as a cushion seat (26). Makihara et al provide no disclosure, teaching or suggestion as to the use of their seat frame structure alone, or in the absence of other seat features, such as a separate seat

cushion. Makihara et al disclose their seat frame structure as being used *for* a vehicle seat, not *as* a vehicle seat. As such, the blow-molded seat frame main body (e.g., 28) of Makihara et al must, by necessity, be rigid.

If Makihara et al's blow-molded seat frame main body were flexible (*e.g.*, having a flexural modulus of less than 1000 MPa, or less than 100 MPa, or less than 70 MPa), their seat frame structure would not function as a seat frame. Makihara et al provide no disclosure, or suggestion as to the blow-molded seat frame main body of their seat frame structure being fabricated from a flexible thermoplastic resin. In light of what Makihara et al actually discloses, a skilled artisan would not be reasonably expected to interpret the disclosure thereof as somehow encompassing a blow-molded seat frame main body of flexible thermoplastic material. In addition, a skilled artisan would not be motivated to modify the disclosed rigid blow-molded seat frame main body of Makihara et al's seat frame structure such that it would be flexible (*e.g.*, having a flexural modulus of less than 1000 MPa, or less than 100 MPa, or less than 70 MPa).

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unobvious and patentable over Makihara et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter as to Claims 10 and 11 on page 5 of the Office Action of 25 March 2004. As discussed previously herein, the subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into Claim 1, Claim 10 has been cancelled, and Claim 11 has been amended to depend from present Claim 1 (rather than cancelled Claim 10) by amendment herein. In light of the allowability of Claims 10 and 11 and the amendments herein, all of Applicants' presently pending claims are deemed to be patentable, and in condition for allowance.

The arguments presented on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action of 25 March 2004 have been, for the record, addressed and countered previously herein.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' presently pending claims are deemed to define an invention that is unanticipated, unovbious and hence, patentable. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the presently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
James R. Franks
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,552

Bayer Polymers LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3808
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902

/jme/JRF/JF0286